

OPINION 2329 (Case 3532)***Murex tubercularis* Montagu, 1803 (currently *Cerithiopsis tubercularis*; Mollusca, Gastropoda, CERITHIOPSIDAE): proposed conservation of usage of the specific name by designation of a neotype not approved**

Abstract. The application to conserve the current usage of the name *Cerithiopsis tubercularis* (Montagu, 1803) for a species of cerithiopsine gastropod from the southern coast of Great Britain by designating a neotype consistent with current usage was not approved.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; CERITHIOPSIDAE; *Cerithiopsis*; *Cerithiopsis tubercularis*; cerithiopsine gastropod; Recent; Atlantic; Mediterranean.

Ruling

- (1) It is hereby ruled that the application for the proposed conservation of the name *Murex tubercularis* Montagu, 1803 in its accustomed usage by designation as neotype the possible syntype BMNH 20090384 at the Natural History Museum, London, is not approved.
- (2) No names are placed on the Official Lists or Indexes in this ruling.

History of Case 3532

The application to conserve the current usage of the name *Cerithiopsis tubercularis* (Montagu, 1803) for a species of cerithiopsine gastropod from the southern coast of Great Britain by designating a neotype consistent with the current usage was received from Alberto Cecalupo (*Via Grancino 6y, 20090 Buccinasco, Italy*) and Elio Robba (*Dipartimento di Scienze Geologiche e Geotecnologie, Università degli Studi di Milano Bicocca, Milano, Italy*) on 15 July 2010. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 68: 41–46 (March 2011). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. Supportive and adverse comments were published in BZN 68(3): 205, 69(1): 56–59 and 69(2): 123–124.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 September 2013 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 68: 44. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2013 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 3: Minelli, Winston and Zhou.

Negative votes – 21: Alonso-Zarazaga, Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Fautin, Grygier, Halliday, Harvey, Kojima, Krell, Lamas, Lim, Ng, Pape, Patterson, Rosenberg, Štys, van Tol, Yanega and Zhang.

Kottelat, Kullander and Pyle were on leave of absence.

Voting AGAINST, Alonso-Zarazaga said that the Case had been presented without a properly worked out taxonomic basis. It should not be presented again until the

proposed morphological and genetic studies of the cryptic species recognised to exist in the genus *Cerithiopsis* have been carried out and only if that study could not solve the existing nomenclatural conflicts. Voting AGAINST, Rosenberg said that, as pointed out by Bouchet & Marshall (BZN 69: 123), the specimen designated by Marshall (1978) as lectotype of *Murex tubercularis* Montagu, 1803 appeared not to be one of the syntypes of the species, but rather a specimen referred to as a white variety by Montagu (1808). Under Article 74.2, it automatically lost its status as lectotype since it was not a syntype; use of the plenary powers was not needed to suppress the lectotype designation. As the proposed neotype would not resolve the taxonomic confusion, he voted against the case. Also voting AGAINST, Bouchet noted that Bouchet & Marshall (BZN 69: 123) had explained in their comment that Marshall's 1978 lectotype designation was invalid, and thus no action was required by the Commission to suppress it. A sequenced neotype could thus be designated in the future by any zoologist without the Commission's involvement. Kojima, also voting AGAINST, stated as well that the proposal should have included a statement as to why the name *Murex tubercularis* should be conserved, e.g. whether or not this gastropod was economically important, or was an important organism for scientists in any field of biology, rather than being important only for specialists on this group of gastropods. It was not clear to him why the name *Murex tubercularis* Montagu, 1803 should be conserved to conform to the prevailing usage of *C. tubercularis* (Montagu, 1803). Voting AGAINST, Krell considered that if *Murex tubercularis* was in fact a group of cryptic species, it seemed to be most appropriate to designate a neotype for which we have sequence information. Prkić et al.'s alternative solution (BZN 69: 56–59) seemed the most appropriate procedure, but Prkić et al. did not suggest a suitable neotype specimen in their comment. Ng, voting AGAINST, said that he thought that options presented in the Case were pointless. The proposed neotype did nothing to help solve the problems outlined in the paper. He considered that in this case a suitable neotype must be one that has fresh colours, and preferably fresh tissues preserved as well, that enable a molecular analysis. Thus, he concluded, this case was not ready for voting.

No names are placed on the Official Lists or Indexes by the ruling in the present Opinion. The issue is left open for subsequent workers to follow the precepts of the Code or to make new proposals to the Commission.